DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 482 308 HE 036 436

AUTHOR	Toma, J. Douglas
TITLE	Legitimacy, Differentiation, and the Promise of the Ed.D. in Higher Education.
PUB DATE	2002-11-00
NOTE	29p.; Paper prepared for the Annual Meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education (Sacramento, CA, November 21-24, 2002).
PUB TYPE	Opinion Papers (120) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Administrator Education; *Doctoral Degrees; Doctoral Programs; Higher Education; Instructional Leadership; *Laboratory Training

ABSTRACT

This paper discusses the Ed.D. and the Ph.D. in Education degrees. Both degrees socialize students into a profession based in service, that enjoys autonomy, and that is grounded in a knowledge base. However, the Ed.D. prepares administrators for professional practice through a practical curriculum, and the Ph.D. concentrates on training faculty and researchers. The ideal is a clear difference between the two degrees, with the Ed.D. training researching professionals and the Ph.D. training professional researchers. This distinction, however, has long been a fiction across U.S. higher education programs. The focus of this essay is that most higher education programs err by using the Ph.D. to prepare administrators, either by preparing them through the wrong means or by labeling Ed.D. training as the Ph.D. Drawing real distinctions between the two degrees is a necessary starting point to move education closer to other professional fields. Ed.D. programs can be more nontraditional and can use new formats that serve students better. The Ed.D. lends itself to the case method, as in law and medicine, and thus to innovation in teaching. Steps toward differentiating the two degrees have been taken at the University of Pennsylvania. In essence, that university has addressed the issue of inputs in differentiating between the two programs, but concerns related to process and outcomes remain. (Contains 37 references.) (SLD)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 482 308

Legitimacy, Differentiation, and the Promise of the Ed.D. in Higher Education

J. Douglas Toma
Associate Chair for the Executive Doctorate, Higher Education Management
Graduate School of Education
University of Pennsylvania
3700 Walnut Street
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19104
toma@gse.upenn.edu

A paper prepared for the Annual Meeting of the
Association for the Study of Higher Education,
Sacramento, California, November 21-24, 2002

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
D. Toma
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

HE036436

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Anyone who resides in a higher education program that offers both the Ph.D. and the Ed.D. – or that gives the Ed.D. in a market full of Ph.D. programs – has been asked by prospective or current students to differentiate between the two degrees. The stock response is that the Ed.D. is focused on application and the Ph.D. on theory development. The common conception is that Ph.D. study is marked by:

- dissertation research on a very narrow subject
- coursework taken over several years with seminars and research papers common
- study through books and journal articles
- individualized work with faculty, including research and teaching assistantships
- competencies in multiple languages (in many disciplines).

In contrast, in the Ed.D.:

- the curriculum is more structured, proscribed, and focused on the acquisition of skills
- faculty are more formal, distant, and authoritative in their relationships with students
- assistantships are minimal and most students attend part-time
- classes are less cohort based
- both role models and standards of performance and quality are external to the university, not internal within it

(Weidman, Twale, and Stein, 2001; Haworth and Bair, 2000).

Both degrees socialize students into a profession based in service, that enjoys autonomy, and that is grounded in a knowledge base – these are the markers of professional practice across

fields. The difference is that the Ed.D. prepares administrators for professional practice though a practical curriculum and the Ph.D. concentrates on training faculty and researchers (Weidman, Twale, and Stein, 2001; Watts, 2000). The ideal is that there is a clear difference between the two degrees – one, the Ed.D., develops researching professionals while the other trains professional researchers. These researching professionals are presumed to view research not an end in itself, but as a means to improving professional practice through applying theory to understand current problems in the field. They focus on what is not known, as opposed to what is already known, starting with a practical problem as opposed to with a literature review. The difference between the two degrees is thus a seemingly sensible one of training career researchers versus providing experienced professionals with the means to extend their expertise (Bourner, Bowden, and Laing, 2000).[1]

However, this distinction has long been a fiction across American higher education programs. Differentiation between degrees was identified as a problem as early as the 1930s in schools of education (Clifford and Guthrie, 1988; Cremin, 1978). Where both degrees are offered at a single institution, degree requirements have long been similar, as a rule, and Ph.D. and Ed.D. students typically enroll in many common classes. This includes even research design and research methods where there would seemingly be the greatest difference (Osguthorpe and Wong, 1993; Richardson and Walsh, 1978). In practice, many programs simply use one degree or the other, usually the Ph.D., offering it to aspiring administrators and researchers alike. This is understandable, as few would dispute that the Ph.D. is the more prestigious of the two degrees,

[1] The discussion of these differences is particularly prominent in England presently, as institutions there introduced the Ed.D. in the 1990s in order to achieve needed differentiation between research-focused and practice-focused preparation in education.

both within the university for faculty and for students within the marketplace (Brown, 1990). Having created a situation where the two degrees are similar in both substance and form, even students clearly interested in administrative careers are likely to opt for the Ph.D. Programs have made the same choice. Indeed, flagship institutions are increasingly likely to favor the Ph.D. over the Ed.D., with the latter commonly associated with comprehensive institutions who offer it because they cannot get state coordinating approval to grant the Ph.D. (Osguthorpe and Wong, 1993). Furthermore, like all disciplines, education had to work its way into the university and then develop credibility within it – and the ability to grant the Ph.D. has provided a marker of a discipline having arrived. In many cases, schools of education could only offer the Ed.D., having to eventually prove themselves "worthy" of giving the Ph.D.[2]

In doing so, education gained the ability to claim standing within the university, but this has been a hollow accomplishment as we have also subjected ourselves to having to apply inappropriate standards and follow inappropriate practices borrowed from the arts and sciences disciplines where the Ph.D. developed. At many institutions, the graduate school, dominated by the arts and sciences, controls the Ph.D., while the Ed.D. resides within the education school (Richardson and Walsh, 1978). Even though all Ph.D.s may be under the aegis of the graduate dean, what matters in applied doctoral study, including in our field of higher education, is utterly different than what is important pure doctoral study. Becher (1994) draws a distinction between disciplines on two axes: pure versus applied and hard versus pure (Becher and Trowler, 2001; Weidman, Twale, and Stein, 2001; Biglan, 1973). Education (like law or engineering) is applied,

---

[2] Harvard, quite famously, has not developed a Ph.D. in education, doing the opposite of other institutions by presenting the Ed.D. to graduates trained for research and faculty careers.

focusing on "know how" and the enhancement of professional practice. The humanities, social sciences, and sciences are pure. They are more cumulative and concerned with simplification and finding consensus, as in the sciences, or are like the humanities in being reiterative and concerned with complication, rarely finding consensus.[3] Applying the same standards to and following the same practices for both future English faculty and aspiring higher education administrators makes little sense. Yet, when educating administrators, which is our predominant activity in higher education programs, we play under rules and assumptions appropriate for developing professional researchers, not researching professionals.

As a result, students aspiring to administrative careers either underperform as Ph.D. students by arts and sciences standards, or they meet these standards and are more prepared for faculty or research careers than the administrative ones they desire. My focus in this essay is that most higher education programs err by using the Ph.D. to prepare administrators, either by preparing them through the wrong means or by labeling Ed.D. training as the Ph.D. As a result, everyone associated with higher education programs suffers. As faculty, we must fight the perception among our colleagues in the arts and sciences that the rigor of our programs is questionable – that we offer an inferior brand of doctoral education. Once again, by choosing to label degree programs aimed at developing researching professionals as Ph.D.s, we subject ourselves to such deserved criticism by accepting standards and practices appropriate to

---

[3] Stark and Lowther, across several studies in the 1980s, suggest that there are differences in preparation environments and thus processes and outcomes, between and among the various professional fields. These are due to external influences (such as societal influences and professional community characteristics); intra-organizational influences; and internal influences (such as mission, staffing, and program organization; professional program structure; curricular tensions; and continuing professional education) (Stark, Lowther, and Haggerty, 1987).

programs for producing professional researchers. Even our students discern – and this is my personal view, unsupported by empirical evidence – that their Ph.D.s are something less than "real" in relations to those given in the arts and sciences.

Even when we meet arts and sciences standards for the Ph.D., which I would argue is not particularly common, as do Clifford and Guthrie (1988), we fail the professional community that we serve by graduating students who have not acquired the competencies needed in professional practice. And our colleagues in the arts and sciences may still remain unconvinced that we are giving "real" Ph.D.s, as it is difficult to separate these students from the mass of graduates in our field receiving what amounts to the wrong degree. Both when we educate students for administrative practice under Ph.D. standards and when we produce bona fide Ph.D.s for administrative practice we are offering a diminished degree. None of this is to suggest that faculty and students in higher education programs are inferior. Nor is it to contend that we are producing sham degrees. We are simply playing by rules defined by and appropriate to those who are working toward different ends in preparing doctoral students. It is the same as if we were to judge qualitative research by standards of validity, reliability, and generalizability appropriate to quantitative work – the research would inevitably fall short as the standards applied are inappropriate. To use a sports metaphor, we are playing football with games refereed by officials from the United States Golf Association.

In contrast, faculty in law and medicine train practitioners at the equivalent of the doctoral level – and the rigor of their work is not typically questioned. The reason is simple: they do not play by the rules of the arts and sciences. Instead, they work under standards and practices appropriate to what they do – training professionals. There are certainly other reasons

for high status of these disciplines and our own suspect position within the university, particularly those grounded in the tradition of education being a field that did not exclude women. Furthermore, business administration, another well-regarded professional field, essentially avoids the challenges associated with providing the Ph.D. in an applied field by offering many fewer degrees and usually to those interested in research or faculty careers. The discipline also has a meaningful terminal masters degree, the MBA, and works from a more privileged social standing than does education.

Nevertheless, these are possible models for higher education programs. In theory, the Ed.D., focused on practitioners, should be common, as most of our graduates assume or continue administrative positions. And it should apply standards and follow practices appropriate to professional education, in essence becoming the analogue of the J.D. in legal education (Clifford and Guthrie, 1988). By extension, the Ph.D. in our field should be rare and exist within the world of the graduate school – and perhaps even with students doing their work in our field in conjunction with an arts and sciences or other professional discipline (Clifford and Guthrie, 1988). Under such a scheme, both degrees would be valued, as should be the case given their different ends.

This is not a new discussion. In 1985, David Dill and James Morrison argued in the Review of Higher Education that there was a need for a distinction between the Ed.D. and Ph.D. in our field. Also writing in the Review, in 1987, Stan Carpenter lamented that traditional disciplines dominate our thinking about the study of higher education and suggested the need for appropriate standards. However, as then, most institutions view it as unrealistic or undesirable to opt out of granting the Ph.D., even if it means putting the square peg of the applied doctorate into

the round hole of the arts and science model for applied doctoral education. What I suggest is that individual higher education faculties put aside these notions and develop relevant and innovative Ed.D. programs that can compete directly with the cache of the Ph.D. for those interested in administrative careers. Reinventing the Ed.D. has the potential to both legitimize us, as a field, within our own institutions by setting and achieving our own standards through following our own practices, as in field like law, medicine, and business. It also offers the possibility to enhance our standing within the professional community that we serve by training graduates who have received distinctive training geared directly toward their professional aspirations.

History works against these possibilities, unfortunately. Institutional theory suggests that like other organizations, universities and academic units within them are isomorphic. The trend is for individual institutions, and by extension academic programs, to tend to grow more similar in structure and operation over time because they copy perceived leaders in a given field (Scott, 1998; Meyer and Rowan, 1985; DiMaggio and Powell, 1983). For comprehensive institutions, the model is the research university. And the trend toward "academic drift" or "mission inflation" is simply one of less prestigious institutions attempting to emulate more prestigious ones through adding the graduate programs and sponsored research associated with the latter. In much the same way, education gained legitimacy within the university – a process that is far from complete – through replicating the practices of the more established disciplines. Education, of course, could have emulated law and medicine in its quest for greater legitimacy (and even business administration, which emerged at about the same time within the university). Accordingly, it is important to understand the evolution of our discipline, particularly in relation

to doctoral education, before exploring the promise of the Ed.D. in higher education at the contemporary university.

The story of the rise of doctoral education in America is a familiar one to many. Yale offered the first earned doctorate through its Sheffield School of Science in 1861, with the University of Pennsylvania granting the first Ph.D. in 1871 (Haworth, 1996a; Nobel, 1994). By then, American faculty who had been educated at German institutions had attained sufficient influence to model a system of doctoral education founded on the production of knowledge. Johns Hopkins was chartered in 1876 expressly for that purpose – and by 1900, more than 50 institutions offered the doctorate and had produced 1,500 doctoral graduates. By the end of nineteenth century, standards such as having an earned bachelors degree at matriculation, residency requirements, comprehensive examinations, and thesis that embodied original research had become common (Goodchild and Miller, 1997; Haworth, 1996a). And the establishment of the American Association of Universities by the leading American universities – the new research universities – institutionalized these practices and assumed an accreditation role, at least initially (Goodchild and Miller, 1997; Haworth, 1996a).

By the early twentieth century, the doctorate had become nearly mandatory for an academic appointment at leading universities (Nobel, 1994). The professorate was, of course, no different than other professional fields, as a more urban, industrial, and interdependent nation increasingly turned to expert authority and professional advice (Haskell, 2001). As doctoral education developed in the United States, the production of knowledge not only became professionalized in the professorate, but also expanded and divided into new disciplines within the university (Haskell, 2001). The sciences had already arrived in the mid-nineteenth century

through scientific schools such as Sheffield and Lawrence at Harvard, expanding the curriculum beyond the classical subjects. Institutions recognized the demand for such training, but were hesitant to give it the same status as the established liberal arts curriculum.[4] Closer to the turn of the century, the social sciences emerged as university disciplines, with fields such as economics, political science, and sociology coalescing around their own professional associations (Haskell, 2001; Ross, 1991). And already the precedent of newer disciplines having to model themselves on established disciplines to gain legitimacy within the university had become established.

Outside of the arts and sciences, professional education also emerged, first in law and medicine toward the end of the nineteenth century. In law, the case method and familiar requirements such as the three-year post-graduate program came to replace apprenticeships – and medicine was integrated into the university in similar ways (Stevens, 1983; Ludmerer, 2000; Starr, 1982). As continues to be the case, the difference between these fields and those in the arts and sciences was that the terminal degree is not given upon the completion of dissertation, but upon the conclusion of a program of study. In addition, almost all law and medicine graduates enter practice, as opposed to remaining within academe.[5] In the early twentieth century, newer professional fields, including those based on the social sciences, such as education and business administration, became established at research universities as doctoral

---

[4] Not until 1906 were the scientific and engineering programs at Lawrence incorporated into Harvard College and the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences.

[5] Other applied fields, however, adopted a model closer to that of the arts and sciences. Applied sciences, such as agriculture and engineering, were at the center the new land grant institutions that were founded in the late nineteenth century and came to offer the doctorate, particularly for those who would become faculty.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

granting entities.[6] These new fields responded to societal demand for expert practitioners – and expertise had become linked with training to the level of a terminal degree (Haworth, 1996a). In business administration this centered on the MBA, while doctoral level study became the standard in education.

In education, there was a formal division between the Ed.D. and Ph.D. from near the beginning, but differentiation has long been a challenge (Clifford and Guthrie, 1988; Cremin, 1978). These degrees were also popular. The first colleges or schools of education were formed in the 1910s and 1920s – and Harvard gave the first Ed.D. in the United States in 1921, with Stanford and Berkeley adding the degree in the 1920s and Teachers College in 1934 (Brown, 1990; Clifford and Guthrie, 1988; Cremin, 1978). By the 1930s, only chemistry produced more doctorates than did education – and by 1941 Teachers College had produced 1,600 doctoral graduates in education (Haworth, 1996).

The rise and expansion of these applied doctorates prompted a strong reaction from academics in traditional fields. Those in established arts and sciences fields challenged the quality of these new fields, arguing that practical ends and vocational aims were inappropriate for doctoral study, which they contend should be a more pure enterprise focused on scholarly research and the preparation of college teachers. Haworth (1996a) notes that even with the continued expansion of doctoral education in the professions – in the 1960s in reaction to the Sputnik launch and beyond – the applied doctorate continues to be controversial. It continues to

[6] Although there were education departments at leading institutions as early as the 1880s, and even a Ph.D. given at Teachers College and at Berkeley in the 1890s, the doctorate did not become popular until well into the twentieth century. In 1910, only 13 Ph.D.s in education were awarded, but it was still the fourth most popular field of doctoral subject (Haworth, 1996a).

be presumed by many in the arts and sciences to lack the purpose and rigor necessary to make it the equal of the Ph.D. in traditional arts and sciences fields. In education, there is the additional challenge of overcoming general "high regard for education and the low repute of the education profession" (Clifford and Guthrie, 1988, p. 11). Indeed, at research universities, schools and colleges of education have been targets of criticism – and there have even been campaigns to close them down at major institutions, including successful ones at institutions such as Yale in the 1950s and Duke in the 1980s.

Furthermore, education schools have traditionally been at a cultural and political disadvantage within research universities, putting less stress than counterparts elsewhere across campus on paramount institutional values such as graduate study, research institutes, external funding, regionally or nationally recruited students, and publishing. (These differences may be less pronounced today, particularly at leading institutions, as education faculty have increasingly internalized the norms and values of the arts and sciences.) Particularly at less prestigious institutions, education schools also tend to hire former administrators as faculty, further diminishing their credibility with academics in the arts and sciences, where this would never happen (Clifford and Guthrie, 1988). In addition, education continues to be associated with normal schools, which emerged to train teachers at the turn of the last century, apart from research universities and doctoral study. These institutions would eventually evolve into comprehensive institutions, broadening their curricula to include the arts and sciences and some professional fields, such as business. Many of these institutions would eventually offer the doctorate – and when they did, the Ed.D. was typically their first doctoral degree. However, these are the same institutions that have pressed to expand their reach into sponsored research

and doctoral education, presuming that it would increase their prestige. And criticisms of mission inflation are often grounded in a lack of quality. (Aldersley, 1995; Smith and Webster, 1997; Clark, 1987; Riesman and Jencks, 1962).

In response to these challenges, education has opted to become ever more like established disciplines in the arts and sciences, attempting to mimic the social sciences, in particular (Osguthorpe and Wong, 1993). This is a predictable result, particularly if one accepts the central premise of institutional theory. Unfortunately, it has also meant that in the search for legitimacy we have either watered down the Ph.D. to accommodate students who have little interest in research and discovery, or we have prepared other students for administrative practice by focusing on research skills. The former has distanced us from our colleagues elsewhere in the university and the latter has separated us from the profession that we serve. In both cases, our students may be left doubting their abilities and accomplishments. Is it also possible that by teaching in programs that are less than authentic, some degree of this lack of authenticity has permeated our research? Does what and how we teach cause us to attempt work that results a poor approximation of the humanities and social sciences or is irrelevant to practitioners in our field that we are supposed to serve as a professional field?

It is interesting that education has continued to accept the Ph.D. in the arts and sciences as the standard given the documented failures in doctoral education in the graduate school over the past three decades. These include the overproduction of graduates, increases in time to degree, and decreases in completion rates – all of which have opened traditional doctoral education to severe and deserved criticism (Geiger, 1997; Bowen and Rudenstein, 1992). In a recent Pew Charitable Trusts report, Chris Golde and Timothy Dore (2001) argue that students in

the arts and sciences do not understand what doctoral study entails, how the process works, and how to navigate it effectively. Their data suggest a mismatch between and among the purpose of doctoral education, the aspirations of the students, and the realities of their careers within and outside academia. In short, there are far fewer faculty jobs than there are graduates, particularly at research universities – but doctoral programs in the arts and sciences continue to prepare graduates primarily for these careers. As a result, students are not well prepared for positions that are available, either at different types of institutions or outside of research or academe. Bowen and Rudenstein (1992) add that there is little accountability in Ph.D. programs in the arts and sciences disciplines, and components of the experience such as advising are isolated and isolating. In contrast, despite the challenges associated with doctoral education in professional fields, such as higher education, graduates commonly find satisfying professional positions in their chosen area, something few Ph.D. producing departments can claim.

The fascinating question to me is whether education, including higher education, can set a new course, attempting to replicate not doctoral study in the arts and sciences, but also to pattern themselves after other professional schools for the overwhelming majority of our students interested in administrative careers. To serve these students, differentiating ourselves from the arts and sciences as a professional field offers a more productive course, I suggest. Drawing real distinctions between the Ed.D. and Ph.D. is a necessary starting point if we are going to move our field closer to other professional fields. And stressing the Ed.D. – a unique doctoral title – might allow schools of education to enjoy the kind of autonomy enjoyed by law and medical schools, despite differences based in social status and gender (Osguthorpe and Wong, 1993; Clifford and Guthrie, 1988). Perhaps the question to ask is whether our higher education

students enroll for a Ph.D., or do they come for a doctoral education that matches the needs of their chosen profession. It is certainly possible to offer both, but doing so diminishes our credibility as a discipline in the broader community of scholars by affixing a pure label on what is clearly applied education. This will not matter to some programs, that will take advantage of an unregulated marketplace and offer the degrees in higher education that they see fit. My purpose is to suggest that by differentiating between the Ed.D. and the Ph.D. that as a scholarly community we can have it all, serving both the profession and having enhanced credibility within academe.

Defining a true professional doctorate – and labeling it as such – has several advantages. Ed.D., programs lend themselves to non-traditional formats and unusual structures that better serve the needs of part-time students in ways that Ph.D. programs modeled on the arts and sciences do not and should not, given their purposes. New formats can serve more students with present resources and provide new revenue sources for higher education programs – and these can increase our standing and leverage within our schools and institutions. Such approaches may also encourage improvement of time-to-degree and retention, as they encourage cohort-based approaches. Alternatives to the traditional dissertation are also more possible, such as portfolio approaches or writing smaller pieces for publication in practitioner journals. This is all doable, as Ed.D. programs do not operate under the norms of the arts and sciences and the requirements of graduate school, but are controlled by schools of education themselves, as a rule (Duke and Beck, 1999).

Furthermore, the Ed.D. lends itself to the case method, as in law and medicine, and thus to innovation in teaching, including the use of new technology. Finally, revitalizing the Ed.D.

affords programs a fresh start that encourages them to define competencies appropriate to professional practice in structuring the curriculum and assess outcomes toward refining it (Smart and Hagedorn, 1994; Stark, Lowther, and Haggerty, 1987; Stark, Lowther, Hagerty, and Orczyk, 1986). Haworth and Conrad (1997) propose a system based on student engagement and including attention to issues such as the purposes of doctoral study, curricular models, employer needs, variation in degree requirements, faculty assignments, student socialization, etc. They also address markers of program quality particularly to professional education (Haworth, 1996a; Haworth, 1996b). This is simply good practice – and something too few of us take sufficiently seriously.

At the University of Pennsylvania, where I teach, we have taken several steps toward refining and implementing the distinction between the Ed.D. and the Ph.D. In concluding this essay, allow me to note some of these in reference to some of the themes discussed thus far. We have far from accomplished our goals – and may not even have the goals quite right in the first place. However, we do offer one model of how change might proceed – and the opportunities and challenges that have been associated with this for us. Our first step was to make the Ed.D. common and the Ph.D. rare. This has been accomplished over the past several years. In Fall, 2002, we will follow what has become our usual pattern and enroll 12 Ed.D. students (6 full-time and 6 part-time) in our traditional program and 20 in our 20-month executive doctorate (which enters its second year), but will only enroll two Ph.D. students. (We will also enroll 19 masters degree students, 12 full-time and 7 part-time.) Unlike Harvard, one of our main competitors, we can offer the Ph.D. in education – and once did and could certainly again offer more Ph.D.s if we, as a faculty, chose to. In AY 2001-02, we received applications from 48 prospective

students for the traditional Ed.D., 77 for our new executive Ed.D., and 37 for the Ph.D. (in addition to 88 applications for our 10-month M.S.Ed. program).[7]

We have also made progress in differentiating between our actual Ed.D. and Ph.D. programs and the standards we apply to student performance. We fund our full-time Ed.D. and Ph.D. students differently. We have developed a number of what we call "mentorships" across campus, where Ed.D. students do sophisticated administrative work in offices across campus both in academic affairs and business affairs. Ph.D. students are funded through fellowships or research assistantships, including serving as policy analysts on projects associated the Institute for Research on Higher Education and its successor, the Knight Higher Education Collaborative. This underscores appropriate application versus research differences between the two degrees. Similarly, we give a different comprehensive examination to Ed.D. and Ph.D. students, focusing on conceptualizing and applying research within professional practice with the former and designing original research in the latter. In other words, our Ed.D. students do in their comps what executives and senior managers do – assign research and read work product critically – and our Ph.D. students do what faculty and researchers do.

Still, several challenges remain:

- We have yet to address the issue that all of our non-executive students – Ph.D., traditional Ed.D., and masters – take the same courses in the same sequence, more or less. Here, we may suffer from the tendency of many academic programs to offer a program based on "what we did last year" and to focus too much on accommodating faculty preference and convenience

[7] It is important to note regardless of what we do and how we do it we are likely to do well in admissions given our Penn's high-profile name and our location in a region under-served by higher education programs.

determining courses offering. We also have the common problem of a small faculty spread too thin. However, we may have an opportunity as we further refine our Ed.D. to add adjunct faculty, as such a program invites such participation.

- It is our increasing sense that our research design and research methods sequence for students in both traditional doctoral programs is wanting, on both the qualitative and quantitative sides. Our students are reaching the dissertation stage having missed some of the basics. This may account, to some extent, for time to degree for our traditional students being perceived as an increasing challenge. This challenge may have less to do with the Ed.D. versus Ph.D. distinction and more with the difficulty of teaching both research design and research methods more generally.

- We have not developed a systematic way to encourage students to take cognate courses – courses outside of our program. Our best students take advantage of this opportunity, particularly courses offered in management and organizations through the Wharton School. Furthermore, we have defined management as the theme for our program, but have yet to really integrate this into the substance of our various courses and have not drawn on Wharton to the extent that we should.

- We have yet to define a set of competencies for each traditional program that we expect students to master. We also only do the most routine evaluation of our courses and there is no mechanism to encourage faculty judged to be performing poorly to improve their work. We know that we have shortcomings and such evaluations will be difficult to read, on occasion,

but there is also an increasing recognition that it is necessary that we move in this direction if we are going to realize our potential.

- Our dissertation requirements are different for the two degrees, but more in theory than in fact. As a rule, Ed.D. students write a 125 or so page thesis evaluating a practical problem in higher education, while Ph.D. students are expected to produce longer theses that develop theory based on original research. Rarely is the distinction that clear. Even in an environment where we channel only those we think will pursue faculty and research careers into the Ph.D., it is unusual that students really do sophisticated theoretical work.

In essence, we have addressed the issue of inputs in differentiating between our traditional Ed.D. and Ph.D. programs, but concerns related to process and outcomes remain if we are going to be able to make honest claims that we are engaging in best practice with regard to both degrees.

We have attempted to address each of these concerns in our new executive doctorate, at least to some extent. In the executive doctorate, which I direct, we have moved to a model where the Ed.D. is celebrated as discrete degree focused on solely administrative practice – and is seen as the equal for administrators to the Ph.D. for aspiring faculty and researchers.[8] We

[8] In my second year at Penn as a visiting research fellow at the Institute for Research on Higher Education, I started floating the idea that a doctoral program for executives and senior managers modeled on the Wharton Executive MBA and other such programs just might work here. (This idea came from a plan in the 1960s, which never really got going, to educate the leaders needed for the burgeoning number of new institutions nationally.) Several senior colleagues, Bob Zemsky and Marvin Lazerson, in particular, put their influence and credibility behind the idea – and we were off and running. I took a visiting faculty appointment here, leaving UMKC, and in Fall, 2000, Chris Hopey, who is now our vice dean for graduate admissions and executive programs, and I developed a marketing program and put ourselves out there. (We were pretty vague, as the program was still more idea than reality.) We were thrilled when over 800 people inquired about our new effort and 60 people applied that first year. That first class enrolled in August, 2001 -- and is moving along according to schedule, having completed their comprehensive examinations and defended their proposals as of June, 2002.

attempted to truly differentiate the Ed.D. from the Ph.D. in a way that would make the former as appealing – if not more attractive – than the latter. Enrollment in the executive doctorate is limited to executive and senior managers in higher education and related industries, those at the vice president, dean, or university-wide director level. Those in the group come to us from all parts of the country and represent the various specialties within higher education management – academic affairs, business and finance, advancement and development, enrollment management, external relations, and student affairs. The program is structured to enable this group to complete the entire program, including the dissertation, within 20 months, without career interruption.

After five-day seminars focused on contemporary issues in higher education management and an introduction to doctoral studies, the cohort meets in Philadelphia each month for 20 consecutive months in three-day, two-night blocks. Students arrive for a 4 p.m. class on Thursday, departing at noon on Saturday. In between, they are scheduled for 15 contact hours with faculty – which certainly makes for full days and evenings. In addition, regular and structured contact via the Internet is an integral component of the program, providing continuity and connection between the monthly blocks. Our notion is that travelling to Philadelphia each month provides the time and space that those at the most senior levels need to focus on their academic work, serving both retention and time-to-degree concerns. Once participants arrive in Philadelphia, they can focus their entire attention to the academic tasks at hand, leaving behind the pressures and distractions of office and home. Participants pay a single price for the program, which includes all tuition and fees, books and materials, and meals and lodging at the

Inn at Penn, which is located on the University of Pennsylvania campus. (We also teach at the Inn, and we remain somewhat uncomfortable about offering an academic program in a conference setting.) Students pay a premium for the program, which is priced at $14,333 per semester for six semesters ($87,000 total). As a result, our students, about 40 percent of whom are fully funded by their institutions with about an equal percentage being partially supported, typically come from more resource-rich institutions and are 45 years old, on average. In the entering class, we have a relatively even proportion of men and women, and 25 percent of our class belong to minority groups.[9]

Over these 20 months, we center the curriculum on advanced topics in higher education management, recognizing that our students already have the foundational knowledge and well-honed skills that come with long experience as executives and senior managers in higher education. We focus on what we have identified as the core management competencies and applied research that executives and senior managers in higher education require. When we use theory, it is to inform practice. In addition to reinforcing an overall appreciation of higher education as an American institution – its history and philosophy, missions and markets, governance and administration, and faculty and students – the curriculum centers on core areas of higher education management. These include advancement and fundraising; quantitative data and decision support; economics and financing; enrollment management; federal and state policy; financial systems and analysis; human resource management; the international context; market, price, and margin; negotiation and bargaining; organizational change; organizational

[9] A complete description of the executive doctorate is available at www.gse.upenn.edu/hem.

restructuring; planning and strategy; preventive law; quality assurance; strategic partnerships; and technology.

We divide this content into 8-hour modules, focusing on the strategic and management challenges that our students confront daily – making this curriculum specific to the Ed.D. and a significant departure from Ph.D. study in higher education at Penn. (Our traditional Ed.D. curriculum should fall somewhere between the two, shading closer to the executive doctorate given the applied nature of the degree.) We have also attempted to introduce coherence into the curriculum through coordinating the content of each module, using the director as a gatekeeper and advisor. The idea is to have each module build on ones that have come before. We have found, however, that this is an ideal that is difficult to achieve and that our curriculum remains more fractured than we would prefer. Nevertheless, we appear to have achieved our intention of crafting a curriculum that is relevant for the most senior leaders in higher education and related industries. Whether we have determined the all of appropriate topics and are paying sufficient attention to each remains an open question. An overall evaluation by the students of the first year of the program yielded a response, for instance, that we need much more content on working with governing boards and much less material on tenure and promotion issues for faculty. We will make changes in both areas. Indeed, we evaluate the program regularly, including a formal qualitative and quantitative evaluation after each module and regular focus group sessions with the students. We have found that our students take their responsibility here quite seriously, particularly as they have seen that we, as a "startup," have adapted our curriculum and logistics as we have moved forward with the first group.

Given the nature of our students and the focus on strategy, senior faculty teach the curriculum. In addition to the core Penn higher education faculty, a diverse group of other leaders from academe, both faculty and administrators, are involved in teaching and advising. For instance, Bob Zemsky from our core faculty teaches on markets; Bill Massy, the former CFO and faculty member at Stanford teaches our module of finance; Lee Bolman, former Harvard faculty member and currently at the University of Missouri-Kansas City teaches organizational change; Larry Moneta, the Vice President for Student Affairs at Duke teaches our partnerships module; Peter Cappelli from the Wharton School teaches negotiation. This arrangement allows for a degree of both flexibility and depth that is unusual on any higher education faculty. Furthermore, as director of the program, I have frequent and regular contact with all of the students, supervising their dissertation work for the first half of the program, chairing several dissertation committees to completion, and serving on the committees of the other students in the program. I am bought out of all but one course in our traditional program, so the executive doctorate is my primary focus. I also teach the applied research sequence, in which we embed considerable dissertation work into the curriculum. We also have a full-time coordinator assigned to the program, a recent Penn M.S.Ed. graduate in higher education management, to address logistical and procedural matters. By setting up the expectation that our students will complete their work in 20 months and staffing the program so extensively, we have shifted much the burden of completion, in essence, from the student to us, as faculty.

This is crucial as the dissertation is the key to the program. Executive doctorate students begin their dissertation work when they first arrive on campus, and we provide a structured and systematic approach to the dissertation. In addition to the introduction to doctoral studies

module, students complete modules on introduction to qualitative research and introduction to quantitative research in Fall; two modules of applied research design in the next two semesters, Spring and Summer, which culminate with their proposal hearings; and a module on qualitative data analysis in the final Fall of the program. (As in our regular Ed.D. program, the overwhelming majority of our executive doctorate students do qualitative case studies for their dissertations.) The research sequence focuses both on preparing students to complete their dissertations and developing competency in assigning research to their staffs and evaluating it upon completion. We encourage students to focus their dissertation on data from their employer, which encourages timely completion and makes the dissertation relevant back home and encourages institutional support. (This also requires us to focus on issues related to executives and senior managers studying areas over which they exercise power and influence.)

We also encourage them to work closely with each other and have found that the investment they have made – with employers, family, and fellow students – has driven them to stay on schedule to complete the program. No one wants to be the one person that does not graduate with the group, making the idea of being "ABD" an alien one. Whether this sequence will prove to be effective is an open question. We are more comfortable that our students will produce true Ed.D. dissertations – studies grounded in practical problems and focused on evaluation toward improved practice. What is important for the argument that I am making here is that we are focusing on tailoring the research curriculum to the needs of students doing research projects grounded in data from their own institutions.

"Getting it right" in crafting an appropriately labeled, genuinely applied, and time sensitive doctorate – or even moving well along toward doing so – is a unique prospect with a

highly motivated group of very accomplished executives and senior executives. In some ways it may be easier than working with a more traditional group, and in some ways it may be more difficult to pull it off. Our main accomplishments with the executive doctorate are that both our students and faculty are energized by the experience and are proud that we are not offering an applied degree with a Ph.D. label. We are instead offering an Ed.D. with real meaning – and it is proving to be a powerful experience for all involved. We are beginning to answer our own question of why a professional administrator in higher education would want Ph.D. anyway. To get a legitimate one a student needs to either prepare for something other than professional practice or fight the lack of legitimacy associated with studying an applied subject under pure rules. There is no reason that the Ed.D. should have secondary status when it is truly different – and truly relevant and truly rigorous. In that setting, there is no reason to view applied doctoral work as anything less than legitimate – and the executive doctorate offers one example, albeit incomplete and imperfect. The key is simple: to have a real distinction between a meaningful Ed.D. and Ph.D. for those interested in research careers who must do what others in social science graduate programs do.

References

Aldersley, S.F. (1995). 'Upward Drift' is Alive and Well: Research/Doctoral Model Still Attractive to Institutions. *Change*, 27(5):50-56.

Becher, T. & Trowler, P. (2001). *Academic Tribes and Territories: Intellectual Enquiry and the Culture of Disciplines, 2nd ed.* Buckingham, England: Open University Press; Society for Research into Higher Education.

Biglan, A. (1973). Characteristics of Subject Matter in Different Academic Areas. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 57, 195-203.

Bourner, T., Bowden, R. & Laing, S. (2000). Professional Doctorates: The Development of Researching Professionals. In T. Bourner, T. Katz, & D. Watson, (Eds.). *New Directions in Professional Higher Education*, 214-25. Buckingham, England: Open University Press; Society for Research into Higher Education.

Bowen, W.G. & Rudenstine, N.L. (1992). *In Pursuit of the Ph.D.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Brown, L. D. (1990). A Perspective on the Ph.D.-Ed.D. Discussion in Schools of Education. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Boston, MA, April 17-20, 1990).

Carpenter, D.S. (1987). Ongoing Dialogue: Degrees of Difference. *Review of Higher Education*, 10(3), 281-86.

Clark, B.R. (1987). *The Academic Life: Small Worlds, Different Worlds*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.

Clifford, G. J. & Guthrie, J.W. (1988). *Ed School: A Brief for Professional Education.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Cremin, L. A. (1978). The Education of the Educating Professions. Charles W. Hunt Lecture. American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education (Chicago, IL, February 21, 1978).

Dill, D. D. & Morrison, J.L. (1985). The Ed.D. and the Ph.D. Research Training in the Field of Higher Education: A Survey and a Proposal. *Review of Higher Education*, 8, 169-86.

DiMaggio, P. J. & Powell, W.W. (1983). Iron Cage Revisited: Institutional Isomorphism and Collective Rationality in Organizational Fields. *American Sociological Review* 48, 147-60.

Duke, N.K. & Beck, S.W. (1999). Education Should Consider Alternative Formats for the Dissertation. *Educational Researcher*, 28(3), 31-36.

Geiger, R. (1997). Doctoral Education: The Short-Term Crisis vs. Long-Term Challenge. *Review of Higher Education*, 20(3), 239-51.

Golde, C. M. & Dore, T.M. (2001). *At Cross Purposes: What the Experiences of Today's Doctoral Students Reveal about Doctoral Education*. Philadelphia, PA: Pew Charitable Trusts.

Goodchild, L. F. & Miller, M.M. (1997). The American Doctorate and Dissertation: Six Developmental Stages. In L. F. Goodchild, K. E. Green, E. L. Katz, & R. C. Kluever (Eds.). Rethinking the Dissertation Process: Tackling Personal and Institutional Obstacles. *New Directions for Higher Education*, 99, 17-32. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Haskell, T.L. (2001). *The Emergence of Professional Social Science : The American Social Science Association and the Nineteenth-Century Crisis of Authority*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Haworth, J. G. (1996a). Doctoral Programs in American Higher Education. In J. C. Smart, (Ed.), *Higher Education: Handbook of Theory and Research*, Vol XI, 372-422. Bronx, NY: Agathon Press.

Haworth, J. G. (1996b). Assessment in Graduate and Professional Education: Present Realities, Future Prospects. In J. G.Haworth, (Ed.), Assessing Graduate and Professional Education: Current Realities, Future Prospects. *New Directions for Higher Education*, 92, 89-97. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Haworth, J.G. & Bair, C.R. (2000). Learning Experiences That Make a Difference: Findings from a National Study of Doctoral Education in the Professions. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education (ASHE) (Sacramento, CA, November 16-19, 2000).

Haworth, J. G. & Conrad, C.F. (1997). *Emblems of Quality in Higher Education: Developing and Sustaining High-Quality Programs*. Boston: Allyn and Boston.

Ludmerer, K.M. (2000). *Time to Heal : American Medical Education from the Turn of the Century to the Era of Managed Care*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Meyer, J.W. & Rowan, B. (1985). Institutionalized Organizations: Formal Structure as Myth and Ceremony. *American Journal of Sociology*, 83(2), 340-63.

Noble, K.A. (1994). *Changing Doctoral Degrees: An International Perspective*. Buckingham, England: Open University Press; Society for Research into Higher Education.

Osguthorpe, R.T. & Wong, M.J. (1993). The Ph.D. versus the Ed.D.: Time for a Decision. *Innovative Higher Education*,18(1), 47-63.

Richardson, R. C., Jr. & Walsh, R.T. (1978). Differences and Similarities in the Practices of Institutions Offering the Ph.D. and Ed.D. Programs in Higher Education. ERIC No.: ED198748.

Riesman, D. & Jencks, C. (1962). The Viability of the American College. In N. Sanford, (Ed.), *The American College*. New York: John Wiley and Sons.

Ross, D. (1991). *The Origins of American Social Science*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Scott, W. R. (1998). *Organizations: Rational, Natural and Open Systems*, 4th Ed. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Smart, J.C. & Hagedorn, L.S. (1994). Enhancing Professional Competencies in Graduate Education. *Review of Higher Education*, 17(3), 241-57.

Smith, A. & Webster, F. (Eds.). (1997). *The Postmodern University*. Buckingham, England: Open University Press.

Stark, J. S., Lowther, M.S., & Haggerty, B.M.K. (1987). Faculty Perceptions of Professional Preparation Environments. *Journal of Higher Education*, 58(5), 530-61.

Stark, J.S., Lowther, M.A., Haggerty, B.M.K., & Orczyk, C. (1986). A Conceptual Framework for the Study of Preservice Professional Programs in Colleges and Universities. *Journal of Higher Education*, 57(2), 231-58.

Starr, P. (1982). *The Social Transformation of American Medicine*. New York: Basic Books.

Stevens, R. B. (1983). *Law School: Legal Education in America from the 1850s to the 1980s*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.

Watts, C. (2000). Issues of Professionalism in Higher Education. In T. Bourner, T. Katz, & D. Watson, (Eds.), *New Directions in Professional Higher Education*. Buckingham, England: Open University Press; Society for Research into Higher Education.

Weidman, J. C., Twale, D.J., & Stein, E.L. (2001). *Socialization of Graduate and Professional Students in Higher Education: A Perilous Passage?* ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report, 28(3). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

HE036436.

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

REPRODUCTION RELEASE

(Specific Document)

I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

Title: Legitimacy, Differentiation, and the Promise of the Ed.D. in Higher Education	
Author(s): J. Douglas Toma	
Corporate Source: Institute of Higher Education, University of Georgia	Publication Date: November, 2002

II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, *Resources in Education* (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce and disseminate the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following three options and sign at the bottom of the page.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 1 documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

Level 1

☑

Check here for Level 1 release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche or other ERIC archival media (e.g., electronic) *and* paper copy.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2A documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE AND IN ELECTRONIC MEDIA FOR ERIC COLLECTION SUBSCRIBERS ONLY, HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2A

Level 2A

☐

Check here for Level 2A release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche and in electronic media for ERIC archival collection subscribers only

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2B documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2B

Level 2B

☐

Check here for Level 2B release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche only

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits.
If permission to reproduce is granted, but no box is checked, documents will be processed at Level 1.

I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce and disseminate this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche or electronic media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries.

Sign here, → please

Signature:	Printed Name/Position/Title: J Douglas Toma, Associate Professor	
Organization/Address: University of Georgia, Institute of Higher Educ. 8 Meigs Hall, Athens, GA 30602-6772	Telephone: 706 542 4836	FAX: 706 583 0281
	E-Mail Address: jdt@uga.edu	Date: 10-11-03

(over)

III. DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY INFORMATION (FROM NON-ERIC SOURCE):

If permission to reproduce is not granted to ERIC, or, if you wish ERIC to cite the availability of the document from another source, please provide the following information regarding the availability of the document. (ERIC will not announce a document unless it is publicly available, and a dependable source can be specified. Contributors should also be aware that ERIC selection criteria are significantly more stringent for documents that cannot be made available through EDRS.)

Publisher/Distributor: none
Address:
Price:

IV. REFERRAL OF ERIC TO COPYRIGHT/REPRODUCTION RIGHTS HOLDER:

If the right to grant this reproduction release is held by someone other than the addressee, please provide the appropriate name and address:

Name: n/a
Address:

V. WHERE TO SEND THIS FORM:

Send this form to the following ERIC Clearinghouse:

However, if solicited by the ERIC Facility, or if making an unsolicited contribution to ERIC, return this form (and the document being contributed) to:

ERIC Processing and Reference Facility
1100 West Street, 2nd Floor
Laurel, Maryland 20707-3598

Telephone: 301-497-4080
Toll Free: 800-799-3742
FAX: 301-953-0263
e-mail: ericfac@inet.ed.gov
WWW: http://ericfac.piccard.csc.com

EFF-088 (Rev. 9/97)
PREVIOUS VERSIONS OF THIS FORM ARE OBSOLETE.